e1 NOT FOR LOAN

E SEMPRUNTE PAS

# NATIONAL TEST DU CENSUS RECENSEMENT TEST NATIONAL

Report No. 8 Question 17: Race or Colour



# ANALYSIS OF NCT QUESTION #17 RACE OR COLOUR

Pamela M. White HFSSD July, 1989

With the assistance of Marcy Tennier

#### SUMMARY

Non-response in Q.17 was 4.7%. There was no indication of a significant entry of backlash or crank entries.

Invalid rate was high due to the entry of colour-type entries, largely entries of Brown and Red.

Mark box options were not applicable to the aboriginal population which resulted in reporting difficulties for this group. The level of non-response and invalids was about 30%.

The NCT Race/Colour question gives counts of the visible minority population that are comparable (5.8%) with the 1986 Employment Equity derived counts (6.3%). Augmented by data from the ethnic origin/identity questions, counts equal to those produced in 1986 could be produced.

The NCT race question gives the basic data required by the Employment Equity Act, in that it provides counts on the visible and non-visible populations. The NCT Race question can not provide the data for separate groups included in the Employment Equity population, i.e. Vietnamese, Filipino, etc.,). Data on these groups must come from another cultural question.

West Asian, Arab and Latin, Central South American populations mark White for race as opposed to Asian or a write-in response. Data for these groups must come from another question.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Maintain the format of the NCT question as it fulfills the essential requirements of the Employment Equity Legislation.
- 2. Add a box for the aboriginal population.
- Retain the term Asian. The term was understood by the appropriate groups. Moreover the write-in space permits persons who wish to be more explicit about their background to enter for example, Chinese, Filipino, East Indian, etc...
- 4. Contingent on the retention of the NCT Q.17 Race question must be the inclusion of an ethnic type question. Should this secondary condition not be met, then a Race question similar to the one accepted for the 1990 US Census should be asked. However, it is important to note that the non-response rate for the MT2 race question was 10%.
- The 1986 Census Ethnic Origin code lists are not adequate for the race question write-in entries. A major overhaul of this coding structure is required for 1991.

## Proposed 1991 Question

17.	Which of the following
	best describes this person's
	race or colour

(Persons of mixed race should mark or print the applicable groups)

- O White
- O Asian
- North American Indian, Metis, Inuit/Eskimo
- O Black

Other race or colour - Specify

Please note that the circle next to Other race or colour has been removed. This circle is an unnecessary source of response error and adds to the response burden.

## CONTENTS

Summary	1
Introduction	1
1.0 Non-response, Backlash Responses	1
2.0 Analysis of Responses	3
3.0 Summary	7
Recommendations	7

Appendix

Tables 1 - 8

#### RACE OR COLOUR -- QUESTION 17

#### Introduction

The National Census Test represents the first time that a race/colour question has been asked by Statistics Canada on a large sample questionnaire using census methodology (drop-off and mail-back). Unlike the MT2 question, the NCT question contained a limited number of mark-boxes (3) and one write-in space.

As well, the term 'visible minority' was not used in the question, though this term has been used in the Labour Market Activity and Overcoverage Study surveys. These surveys have shown that the term 'visible minority' is not well understood by the average respondent. Moreover, minority groups such as francophones and immigrants tend to self-identify as a visible minority eventhough they are not by virtue of their race or colour part of the visible minority population.

# Analysis Issues:

This report will focus on the following analysis issues:

- Was there a non-response or backlash response problem associated with the NCT question on race or colour?
- Can the responses be used to derive a visible minority population and how do the NCT estimates of this population compare with the 1986 counts?.
- Do ethnic groups specified in Q.15 (origin) and Q.16 (identity) respond as expected to question 17 (race or colour)?

## 1.0 Non-response, Backlash Responses

#### 1.1 Non-response

The level of non-response for the race/colour question (Q.17) was 4.7% nationally. This level is comparable with that experienced for Q.15 (4.9%) and Q.16 (4.8%). Non-response was highest in Western Canada, particularly British Columbia (8.7%) and Alberta (7.3%). This trend was also present in the non-response rates for Q.15 and Q.16 (see Table 1).

Examination of Q.17 data by mother tongue groups shows that non-response was higher than 5% for respondents having the following mother tongues: Chinese (6.7%), Dutch (9%), Spanish (6.4%), Polish (5.2%) Punjabi (17.9%) and French and Other (5%). As well, 35.4% of those who did not answer the mother thongue question also did not answer Q.17.

It should be noted that for respondents having a Punjabi mother tongue rates of non-response were high for the questions on the origins of parents and grandparents (15.7%) and ethnic identity of self (17.9%).

When the race question was cross-tabulated by place of birth of respondent the following places of birth showed a greater than 5† non-response to the Race question: Jamaica (8.7\*), Central America (8.5\*), Middle East/West Asia (8.1\*) and the Indian subcontinent (7.0\*). As well, 72\* of those who were non-response to the place of birth question (Q.11) were also non-response to the race question (Q.17).

When the ethnic origin of parents and grandparents question (Q.15) was cross-tabulated by Q.17, the single response aboriginal population had the highest non-response rate (13.6%) and invalid rate (15.7%). The remaining ethnic groups had a non-response rate at or lower than 5%. As well, 52% of those who did not answer the ancestry question also did not answer 0.17.

It should be noted that for the single response aboriginal population defined in 0.15, one-third marked White, 33% wrote in a codable entry of aboriginal while another 29% gave a non-response or invalid answer. It would appear that this group experienced difficulty responding to this question. For more information on this group, please refer to the NCT report of A. Signer.

When the ethnic identity of self question (Q.16) was cross-tabulated by Q.17 (race), the aboriginal population had the highest levels of non-responses (11.9%) and invalid responses (13.9%). As well, respondents who gave their ethnic identity as being Other African also had a high non-response rate (12.4%).

In contrast to the ethnic origin of parents and grandparents question, the ethnic identity of self respondents who gave the following multiple responses had non-response rates greater than 5%: British and Other (6.8%), Canadian, French and Other (11.6%) and British, French and Other (6.3%). As well, 62.6% of those who were non-response to the ethnic identity question (Q.16) were non-response to the race question (Q.17).

## 1.2 Backlash Responses

Invalid responses were higher for the race/colour question (0.17) compared with 0.15 (origin) and 0.16 (identity). This higher rate was due to the presence of write-in entries not matching the Population Code Book. Analysis of an Alpha listing of these write-in entries shows that 1.28 could be classed as crafk/backlash entries) for example — Human, 1/32, Sparcity of Mela, etc. A further 24.6% were colour entries, of which Brown and Red were the most common (see Table 2).

In addition to the entry of colour-type entries, some respondents chose to ignore the pre-printed boxes on the questionnaire and gave an 'ethnic/cultural type' as opposed to a race or colour response. These included entries that could be coded to Canadian (1.6%), French (.3%), British (.1%) and European (1%). By far the largest number were Chinese (1.6%), East Indian (3%), West Asian (2%) and Central American groups (1.4%). These responses, like the aboriginal entries which represented nearly half of all write-ins, are probably not backlash responses. Rather, they are likely responses provided by respondents who did not find the Asian mark-box to be appropriate or descriptive enough and so wished to describe their background more completely. As well, Latin, Central and South American respondents were expected to write-in a response.

## 2.0 Analysis of Responses

#### 2.1 Response Patterns

The circle White was checked by 88.8% of the population, Asian by 3.6% and Black by 1.2%. Both White and Asian by 0.1%, White and a write-in by 0.1%, non-response was 4.7% and invalids were 0.5%. Write-ins of European accounted for 0.1% of responses, Asian write-ins for 0.2%, aboriginals for 0.4% and Latin, Central and South American entries for 0.1%. In total, multiple responses accounted for Just-under-.3% of all responses.

A summary of Q.17 data, unadjusted and adjusted for non-response and invalids, are shown on the following page.

The NCT Race results-compare favourably with the counts derived from—the 1986 ethnic origin question by Employment Equity. (See Table 3 which uses the Employment Equity approach whereby the aboriginal population is shown separately from the visible minority population group.)

Ouestion 17 Responses, Canada, NCT

Group	Unadjusted	Adjusted	_
White	% 88.9	ቴ 93.8	
Asian	3.8	4.2	
Black	1.2	1.3	
Aboriginal	0.4	0.4	
Other Visible	0.1	0.1	
Mixed	0.2	0.2	
Non-response	4.7	N/A	
Invalid	0.5	N/A	

Table 3 shows that the NCT race question yields a visible minority population of 5.8%, which is .5% lower than the 1986 Employment Equity derived population. The impact of sample variance on the NCT estimates for this population were most evident for the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan. Sample variance had less of an impact on the NCT estimates for Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. However, with a sample variance for Canada of 3.9%, the difference 0.5% between the 1986 data and those obtained from NCT for the visible minority population is not significant.

Table 4 compares individual groups within the employment equity definition. The E.E. data and the NCT data have been grouped together into 3 major categories: Asian, Black and Other/Mixed. Table 4 shows that the NCT Black count was about 3.4% less the E.E. derived count and the Asian count was 6.7% less the 1986 count. However, when the coefficient of variance is computed for these groups, it becomes apparent that the NCT estimates are within acceptable levels compared with the 1986 counts for these groups.

The greatest difference occurred in the Other/Mixed category which was 68.6% lower compared with the Employment Equity counts. Eventhough, the C.V. for this group is 22.3%, the NCT Other category remains lower compared with the 1986 counts for this group.

# EMPLOYMENT EQUITY COMPARED WITH NCT Q. 17 RACE

Employment Equity (1986 Census)

Non-visible 93.7

Asian 4.6

Black 1.4
Other 0.3

NCT Q. 17 Race

White 94.2
Asian 4.2
Black 1.3
Other 0.3

\* Visible Minority Population 5.8%

<sup>\*</sup> Visible Minority Population 6.3%

Another factor is that Table 4 masks a reporting pattern for the West Asian, Arab and Latin, Central and South American groups. While these three groups are considered to be part of the visible minority population by Employment Equity, respondents from these backgrounds did not mark Asian or write-in their respective group(s). Over 85% of those who said their ethnic origin (Q.15) was West Asian or Arab marked White' on the race question. Over 70% of those who gave their origins as being Latin, Central South American also gave the answer 'White' on Question 17. Table 5 shows the response patterns of these groups.

If the counts of West Asian, Arab and Latin, Central South American were to be removed from the 'White' race category, the overall Asian and Other groups would increase bringing the NCT counts closer to the 1986 derived counts (see Table 6).

## 2.2 Ethnic origin/Ethnic Identity Responses by Race

Overall, the various ethnic groups responded to the race question as expected (see Table 7). The case of the West Asian, Arab and Latin, Central and South American groups has already been discussed, though such a response pattern was not totally unexpected. The Overcoverage Study, MT2 and focus groups had suggested that these ethnic groups do not necessarily perceive themselves to be part of Canada's visible minority population.

White category

The following groups, based on the origins of parents and grandparents (0.15), reported over 95% of respondents as being White: Canadian, British, French, European and Jewish, Canadian and British, Canadian and French, Canadian, British and French, British Only, French Only and British and French. A small proportion of South Asians (1.5%), Chinese (1.3%) and Japanese (3.9%) gave White in 0.17.

When the Ethnic identity of self (Q.16) was cross-tabulated by Race (Q.17) the percentages were similar to those shown in Q.15 for the British, French, European and Canadian groups, but dropped for the South Asian, Chinese and Japanese groups. The multiple responses showed some variation but stayed above 92% white.

It is interesting to note that for the group which gave gave an entry coded to Black in Q.15 (origins of parents and grandparents), 9.6% gave the response White. Of those who gave the Ethnic identity of Black, 0% gave White. This anomaly may be due to coding, for example, if the respondent gave the answer of Kenyan or Tanzanian the code assigned would be African Black (grouped into Black for the purposes of analysis in NCT). However, this respondent could be White, Asian or Black.

17. 1 Was a way of the

The 'Other African' category is equally ambiguous as it is supposed to group together the white African population. However, given the high Black responses provided by this group in Q.17, it is clear that coding strategies will have to be re-worked (see Table 7).

Asian category

Over 80% of respondents in the following groups marked Asian: Chinese, Korean, Indo-Chinese, South Asian and Filipino. There was considerable variation among groups as 100% of the Koreans gave Asian as opposed to 80.1% of the South Asians. As shown on Table 8, write-ins of South Asian were given by 12.3% of those who declared themselves to be South Asian in Q.15. The Pacific Islanders overwhelming wrote-in their response in Q.17 (100%) as opposed to marking Asian. A written response coded to Other Asian' was given by 7.8% of Japanese and 2.3% of the Filipino groups. Invalid rates were high for the Filipino (14.4%) and Other Asian (55.9%) groups.

Table 8 also shows the pattern of responses given by respondents who stated that their ethnic identity was Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Other Asian, and South Asian. Many of the trends seen in Q.15 hold in the Q.16 population, though the percentage of responses in the Asian category tend to be higher in the Q.16 population. This may be due to the tendency of the 'core' ethnic population, such as immigrants and those with a non-official mother tongue, to give non-Canadian ethnic identities.

Black category

The Caribbean ethnic origin and identity group had the highest Black response, 82.8% (Q.15 - origin) and 75% (Q.16 - identity). Black was checked in Q.17 by 73.4% of those who said they were Black in Q.15 (origin) and by 84.7% of those who were Black in Q.16 (identity). Of those who were of Other African origin in Q.15, 87.6% marked Black in Q.17 (race) and of those who were Other African in Q.16 (identity), 66.4% marked Black in Q.17 (race).

Differences in the Black reporting in Q.15 (origin) and Q.16 (identity) by Q.17 (race) have a great deal to do with the coding of ethnic origin and identity responses as high Asian counts were reported in Q.17 (race). As well, there appears to be a change in the reporting of Other African as an ethnic origin as opposed to an ethnic identity.

It is important to note that less than 1% of the South Asian Group (Q.15, Q.16) gave Black in Q.17. As well, less than 1% of the British ethnic and identity groups gave Black in Q.17 race. This pattern reporting of ethnic origins by various racial groups is problematic when the ethnic origin data are used to derive counts for Employment Equity purposes.

#### SUMMARY

Non-response in Q.17 was 4.7%. There was no indication of a significant entry of backlash or crank entries.

Invalid rate was high due to the entry of colour-type entries, largely entries of Brown and Red.

Mark box options were not applicable to the aboriginal population which resulted in reporting difficulties for this group. The level of non-response and invalids was about 30%.

The NCT Race/Colour question gives counts of the visible minority population that are comparable (5.8%) with the 1986 Employment Equity derived counts (6.3%). Augmented by data from the ethnic origin/identity questions, counts equal to those produced in 1986 could be produced.

The NCT race question gives the basic data required by the Employment Equity Act, in that it provides counts on the visible and non-visible populations. The NCT Race question can not provide the data for separate groups included in the Employment Equity population, i.e. Vietnamese, Filipino, etc.,). Data on these groups must come from another cultural question.

West Asian, Arab and Latin, Central South American populations mark White for race as opposed to Asian or a write-in response. Data for these groups must come from another question.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- Maintain the format of the NCT question as it fulfills the essential requirements of the Employment Equity Legislation.
- Add a box for the aboriginal population.
- Retain the term Asian. The term was understood by the appropriate groups. Moreover the write-in space permits persons who wish to be more explicit about their background to enter for example, Chinese, Filipino, East Indian, etc.,.
- 4. Contingent on the retention of the NCT Q.17 Race question must be the inclusion of an ethnic type question. Should this secondary condition not be met, then a Race question similar to the one accepted for the 1990 US Census should be asked. However, it is important to note that the non-response rate for the MT2 race question was 10%.
- The 1986 Census Ethnic Origin code lists are not adequate for the race question write-in entries. A major overhaul of this coding structure is required for 1991.

# Race Question, NCT

1 O White	
2 Asian	
3 O Black	
4 Other race or colour - Specify	
	1

# Proposed 1991 Question

17. W	Which of the following best describes this person's	0	White
	race or colour	0	Asian
	(Persons of mixed race should mark or print the applicable groups)	0	North American Indian, Metis, Inuit/Eskimo
		0	Black
			Other race or colour - Specify

Please note that the circle next to Other race or colour has been removed. This circle is an unnecessary source of response error and adds to the response burden.

Table la: Mpn-Response, MCT Questions, Canada, Provinces

				•••••	•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Q.15 Sthaic Feaber	Ideatity Percent	Q.16 Bths: Feaber	ic Identiti Percent	g.17 Ra Busber	Percent
Canada	1,252,000	1.31	1,209,000	1.13	1,202,000	1.71
Tevfoundland	21,000	3.71	10,000	3.34	14,000	2.43
Prince Edvard Island	11,000	1.11	12,000	3.R	11,000	I.N
Tova Scotia	37,000	1.31	30,000	1.10	10,000	4.63
Hev Branswick	22,000	3.1%	23,000	3.387	20,000	2.1
Quebec .	223,000	3.41	227,000	3.51	255,000	3.5%
Ontario	401,400	4.31	407,000	1.11	359,000	3.81
Manitoba I	35,000	3. (1)	33,800	3.21	30,000	3.74
Saskatchevan !	30,000	3.98	36,000	3. m	40,000	4.20
Alberta	232,000	3.81	170,000	7.63	171,000	1.38
British Columbia	233,000	1.13	236,000	1.13	255,000	1.71

fable 1b: Invalid Responses, ECT Questions, Canada, Provinces

	Q.15 Ethnic Bunber	Identity Percent		nic Identit  Percent	Q.17 Rad Bunber	e     Percent
Canada	45,000	1.21	46,000	0.1%	119,000	0.53
Bevfoundland		I.N	•	0.11	•	· 1.n
Prince Bdvard Island	•	1.13	0	0.83	1	0.13
Jova Scotia	1	ı.n	2,000	0.23	3,000	1.33
lev Bransvick	1	ı.n		0.01	•	0.11
Quebec !	3,000	1.11	3,000	0.03	11,000	1.23
Ontario	10,000	1.11	4,000	0.11	60,000	1.61
Hanitoba I	6,000	1.53	6,000	0.61	15,000	1.50
Sastatchevan !	2,000	0.23	2,000	0.23	11,000	1.21
àlberta i	23,000	1.0	25,000	1.01	14,000	1.11
Writish Columbia	1,000	0.13	1,000	0.01	•	1.81

All data rounded to nearest thousand.

Table 2: Listing of Write-in Entries, Q.17 - Race/Colour (unweighted)

CATEGORY	SUB-TOTAL	
SKIN COLOUR	 	
Red	2.8	
White	0.5	
Yellow	0.3	
Other Colours		3.0
Brown	14.4	
Bronze	1.4	
Pink	0.7	
Olive	0.7	
Mixed Colours	1 0.2 1	10.7
Red & White	0.2	
	. 0.2	3.2
Tones	! !	
Coloured	0.7	
Medium	0.2	
Dark	0.1	
Pair	0.1	1.1
Sub-total	, i I I	24.6
STHNIC GROUP/REGION	i i	
Bast Indian	i 3 i	
Spanish	1.8	
Chinese	1.6	
Oriental	1.6	
Asian	i 1 i	i
Rurasian	I 0.8 I	- 1
West Indian	0.8	i
Canadian	0.6	i
Rl Salvadorian	0.6	
	0.6	i
Lebanese	0.6	ï
Caucasian	0.5	
	0.5	- 1
	0.5	
	0.4	i
Latin	0.3 1	i
Middle Bastern	0.3	· ·
Vietnamese	0.3	i
Arab	0.2	i
Central American (Central America)		
	0.2	
	0.1	
	0.1	i
	0.1	
	0.1	;
	0.1     0.1	- !
		!
KUSSIAN Sudanese (Sundanese)	0.1     0.1	17.1
Nixed	1 0.1 1	17.1
	0.7	¦
		,

CATEGORY	SUB-TOTAL	TOTAL
	   0.6	
	0.5	
	0.3	
	1 0.2 1	
	1 0.2 1	
	0.1	
Asian & Metis	0.1	
	0.1	
Indian/Ukrainian		
	0.1	
2-7-2-1	0.1	
Scotch & Cree	0.1	
Scoton & Cree		3.2
Sub-total		20.3
COMBINED SKIN COLOUR & ETHNIC GROUP		
Brown Indian	0.5	
Red Indian	0.7 i	
Brown Bast Indian	0.2	
	0.2	
White & Indian		
White Indo-Canadian		
Yellow Japanese	0.1	1.9
	15	
Indian		
	7.5	
Native Canadian		
Aboriginal		
Native White	0.8 (	
Native Appearance	0.3 [	
		20.4
North American Native   Cree	0.1   2.8	39.4
NicNac (		
1-1-1	0.3 (	
Sechelt   Sioux		
	0.2	
Ojibway   Metis	0.1	!
net15 [	9.6	14
Sub-total		53.4
CRAMK RESPONSES	1	
	0.8	;
1/32	0.2 1	;
1/16 Breed	0.1	- :
Noctoroon	0.1	· ;
Sparcity of Mela	0.1	1 2 1
	U.1 	1.3
TOTAL I	- 1	101.5

# Reference for Table 2.

CATEGORY	ACTUAL WRITE-IN RESPONSES	1 3	TOTAL &
Red		2.5	
	rouge	0.2	i i
		0.1	2.8 1
		i	i i
Brown	brown	12.4	i i
	(brouin (Malay)	0.4	
	Ibrun	0.4	i i
	Ibrune	0.4	i i
	lbrown skin	0.3	i i
	llt. brown	0.3	i i
	brown light	0.1	i i
	ldark brown	0.1	
Bronze	  bronze	0.7	 
DI UNIDO	Itan	0.6	
	beige	0.1	
	l	1	
Olive	olive	0.1	1 1
	shallow (sallow)	0.1	
Black & White (Mulatto)	  mulatto	1 1.2	
Black a wille (Mulacto)	mixed brown	0.4	
	black white	0.3	
	Inalada	0.3	
	Cafe ole	0.3	
	Imalado	0.1	
		0.1	
	Imalito	0.1	
	imallaatto	0.1	
	imeloto	0.1	
	•	0.1	
	I	1	1 1
Coloured	coloured	0.6	1 1
	colloured	0.1	
Bast Indian	  Bast Indian	l I 1.5	
	India	0.8	i i
	Indian, India	0.4	
	Basi Indian	0.1	i i
		0.1	
		0.1	
		! !	
Spanish	Spanish	1.5	
	Espagnol	0.2	
	Spansih 	0.1	1.8 !
Chinese	Chinese	1.5	i
	Chinse	0.1	
lain.	13-1		
Asian	Asian	0.9	1 1

CATEGORY	ACTUAL WRITE-IN RESPONSES	1 1	TOTAL 1	ļ
	Asia	0.1	1	İ
Canadian	Canadian		1	i
	Canadian\	0.5	0.6	i
		i ''-	0.0	
Bl Salvadorian		0.5		•
	Blsalvadorian	0.1	0.6	
		1		i
Middle Bastern		0.2		
	Mid Bastern	0.1	0.3	ı
Azab	lane.	! !		
arab	Arab  Arabic	0.1		
	IALADIC	0.1		
Halfbreed		1 0.5 1		
	half Breed	0.5		
Part Indian		0.4		
		0.1		
	1	i		
French Cree	French Cree	i 0.2 i		
	Cree French	0.1	0.3 [	
D T-41-		1 1	1	
Brown Indian		0.2		
		0.1		
		0.1		
		0.1	0.5	
Red Indian		0.3 1		
	Indian red			
		0.1	0.6	
	1		1	
Brown Bast Indian	Bast Indian brow		. i	
		0.1	0.2	
Wanth tanning to the	1	1	İ	
North American Indian		3		
	N.A.Indian		1	
	MA Indian       Canadian Indian		1	
		1.2		
	111.75	1   0.9	1	
	Indian W.A.		- 1	
	No Amer Indian		i	
	Wrth Amren Indn		i	
	luch water indian	0.5	i	
	N American India	0.4	i	
	Can. Indian		1	
	No Am Indian		1	
	Indian (Cdn)		- 1	
	Indian(Cdn)		1	
	Amer Indian  Amerindianne		1	
	10-11 6 4		!	
	(Indian Canada	0.1	1	

CATEGORY	ACTUAL WRITE-IN RESPONSE		TOTAL &
	Indian Mexico	0.1	
	(Indiasn (Cdn)	0.1	1 1
	Indien d'ameriqu	0.1	i i
	N.A Indian	0.1	i i
	M.A. Indian	0.1	
	INAm Indian	0.1	i i
	INAI Indian	0.1	
	Inat Indian	0.1	
	North American/I	0.1	
	North Maerican	0.1	
	Northamerican I	0.1	
	With Amican Indn	0.1	
		1 0.1	1 13 1
Indian	Indian	11.1	i i
	Inative Indian	2.8	1
	Indain	0.2	i i
	Indian native	0.1	
	Indien	0.1	
	Indienne	0.1	
	Inty Indian	0.1	
	1	i	
native Canadian	native Can	0.5	
	native Canadian	0.4	I
*	native Cdn	0.2	l 1
	native-Cdn	0.1	I
	native/Cdn	0.1	1.3
Cree	  Cree	1.8	
CIEE	Cree Indian	0.9	
	Indian (Cree)	0.3	
		1 0.1	4.0 1
MicMac	MicMac Indian	0.5	i
	Mic Mac Indian	0.3	I
	MicMac	0.2	1
	!	! !!	. !
Sechelt	Sechelt/Metis Na	0.2	
	Sechelt Indian	0.1	0.3
Metis	  Metis	8.5	ı i
	Metis Indian	0.7	
	Metisse	0.2	
	Metts	0.1	
	N.A. India (Metis	0.1	9,6 1

Table 3: Comparison of Employment Equity (E.E.) Derived Visible Minority
Population, 1986 Census and Adjusted MCT Race (Q.17) Population Counts.
Canada, Provinces.

4	Total	B.B.	1 1	BC1 (3)	Non-White	1	Coefficient	of Var	iance [95%)]
Canada (1)	24,946,625	1,576,030	6.3%	25,404,000	1,461,000 (2)	5.80%	3.9	+/-	114,000
Newfoundland !	564,005	3,415	0.6%	564,000	1,000	0.15%	68.5	+/-	1,000
Prince Bdward Island	125,090	1,295	1.0%	127,000		0.23%			1
Nova Scotia	864,150	24,390	2.8%	869,000	23,000	2.60%	17.7	+/-	8,000 1
Hew Brunswick	701,855	1,265	1.0%	702,000	6,000	0.80%	23.1	+/-	3,000
Quehec i	6,454,490	224,775	3.5%	6,537,000	157,000	2.40%	12.5	+/-	39,000
Ontario !	9,001,170	775,246	8.6%	9,330,000	748,000	8.02%	6.6	+/-	99,000
Manitoha !	1,049,315	54,755	5.2%	1,031,000	59,000	5.70%	10.4	+/-	12,000
Saskatchevan	996,695	23,325	2.31	996,000	13,000	1.30%	18.2	+/-	5,000
Alberta I	2,340,265	166,670	7.13	2,356,000	141,000	6.00%	7.4	+/-	21,000
British Columbia	2,849,585	294,885	10.3%	2,923,000	322,000	11.40%	5.9	+/-	38,000 j

<sup>(1)</sup> Excludes the Yukon and Borthwest Territories.

<sup>(2)</sup> Due to weighting and variance, provincial estimates of the visible minority populations do not equal the total for Canada.

<sup>(3)</sup> BCT data rounded to nearest thousand.

<sup>\*</sup> value under 1,000

Table 4: Comparison of Black, Asian and Other Mixed Groups, 1986 Census Employment Equity and NCT Race Data.

GROUP	E.E. (1)   	NCT (2)    -	DIFFERENCE   	* DIFF.	NCT C.V.	NCT RANGE   (95%) 
Black (3)	355,600	344,000	(11,600)	-3.4%	8.5	1+/- 58,000
Asian (4)	1,141,175	1,070,000	(71,175)	-6.78	4.9	  +/- 105,000
Other (5)	80,950	1 48,000 1	(32,950)    (31,950)	-68.6 <b>%</b>	22.3	  +/- 21,000 
Total		1.461,000		-8.0%	3.9	  +/- 114,000

- Includes Yukon and Northwest Territories as data by province by group has not been published by B.E.
- (2) Adjusted for non-responses and invalid responses. All data rounded to nearest thousand.
- (3) 1986 Black count from Ethnic Origin question was 260,335.
- (4) Includes West Asian/Arab.
- (5) Includes multiples and Latin, Central & South America.

Table Sa: Selected Ethnic Groups (Q.15) by Bace, MCT, Canada.

	Response i Group I			Selected	Single Re	sponse Grou	ps - Race/O	colour 10.	171		
	2.15)	White	Asian	Black	Prench	Buropean	T.Asian	grap	L,C,S.Am.	Bos-resp.  	lovalid
VEST :	ASIAN I				1	1	1		 		
1	26,000	22,000	3,000			!	!		! !		•
1	100.0	86.3%	13.38		1 1	1			! !	) ) {	0.4
AR A B		!	! !		! !			 	 !	 [	
1	14,000	38,000	1,000		1	!		4,000	1		
,	100.0	87.13	2.51		1 1 1	-		8.7%	1	1.23	0.
L,C,	. AMBRICA	 !	 !	-	! !	!		 	 !	! !	
ı	52,000	37,000		3,000	1,000	4,000			2,000		5,000
1	100.0	70.43		5.31	2.5	1.21	-		4.31	0.63	9.

all data rounded to nearest thousand.

West Asian, C.V. = 23.79; at 95% = +/- 12,000 Arab, C.V. = 21.21; at 95% = +/- 18,000 L.C.S. American, C.V. = 28.88; at 95% = +/- 33,000

<sup>\*</sup> value under 1,000

Table 5b: Selected Sthnic Groups (Q.16) by Race, MCT, Canada.

Single Ethnic	Response	Selected Single Response Groups - Race/Colour (Q.17)												
	.16	Thite	Asian	Black	French	Rur opean	T.Asian	l Arab	L,C,S.A.	Bon-resp.	Invalid			
VEST 1	IM I	I		1	]	1	i i	i I						
1	29,000	26,000	3,000	! !		!		! !	ļ	] 				
1	100.0	87.93	11.7	; 			! !	l Í	 		0.4			
7678	 !	 !		<u>.</u>	<u></u> !	! !		 !	: !	· !				
ï	29,000	24,000	1,000		İ	! !	] ]	2,000	[ [	i ! ! * !	1,000			
1	100.0	83.5%	3.8%	i I	i	;   	! ! !	7.3%	i i	1.2%	5.0			
L,C, S.	PMESICY	!		 !	!	!			!					
ij	52,000	37,000	1,000		1,000	4,000	- !		1 1 3,000	2,000	4,000			
1	100.0	70.5%	2.1%		2.5%	8.1%	i i		6.4	3.2%	7.1			

All data rounded to nearest thousand.

West Asian, C.V. = 25.4; at 55% = +/- 17,000 Arab, C.V. = 23.24; at 55% = +/- 13,000 L.C.S. American, C.V. = 26.56; at 55% = +/- 28,000

<sup>\*</sup> walue under 1,000

Table 6: Additions to the NCT Race Counts Were Those Who Gave West Asian, Arab or Latin, Central and South American Origins in Q.15 Included in the Non-White population

Group	NCT(Q.17)	NCT Q.15 Additions	Derived Race Based on Q.17/(Q.15)	
Asian	1,070,000	61,000	1,131,000	
Other/ Mixed	48,000	50,000	98,000	
	v. 4.9%; at 95 ed, c.v. 15.8%	% +/- 111,000 ; at 95% +/- 31	,000	

Additions to the NCT Race Counts Were Those Who Gave West Asian, Arab or Latin, Central and South American Origins in Q.16 Included in the Non-White population

Group	NCT (Q. 17)	NCT Q.16 Additions	Derived Race Based on Q.17/(Q.15)
Asian	1,070,000	58,000	1,128,000
Other/ Mixed	48,000	37,000	85,000

-----

Asian c.v. 4.9%; at 95% +/- 110,000 Other/Mixed c.v. 17.1% +/- 29,000

Due to the lower counts that can be obtained from Q.16, the additions to the derived NCT visible minority population are lower.

All NCT data rounded to nearest thousand.

Table 7. Ethnic Groups which gave White, Black or Asian as responses to Q.17 (Race - MCT), Canada.

					********	
DRIDITA		ORIGIN (Q.1		* BTHNIC I	DENTITY (Q.1	
ETHNIC GROUP	WHITE	ASIAN	BL7CX	WHITE	ASIAN	BLACK    
						=======
British	96.10%	0.00%	0.70%	96.00%	0.10%	0.80%
Prench	97.00%	0.01%	0.008	97.60%	0.00%	
Aboriginal	31.40%	0.60%	1.414	28.90%	0.70%	1.50%
Canadian	98.00%	0.10%	0.42%	97.20%	0.60%	0.40%
West European	96.40%	0.10%	0.01%	97.30%	0.08%	0.00%
Worth Buropean	97.60%	0.00%	0.00%	96.50%	0.00%	0.003
Bast Buropean	98.00%	0.04%	0.00%	98.90%	0.00%	0.001
South European	97.90%	0.00%	0.07%	96.80%	0.08%	0.70%
Jewish	96.50%	0.00%	0.00%	97.70%	0.00%	0.00%
West Asian	86.30%	13.25%	0.00%	87.90%	11.70%	0.003
Arab	87.10%	2.50%	0.00%	83.90%	3.80%	0.00311
South Asian	1.52%	80.10%	0.184	0.58%	82.90%	0.194
Indo-Chinese	0.00%	98.70%	0.00%	0.00%	96.50%	0.001
Chinese	1.32%	92.40%	0.001	0.95%	97.20%	0.001
Korean	0.00%	100.00%	0.00411	0.00%	100.00%	0.001
Japanese	3.90%	85.80%	0.001	2.80%	86.80%	0.001
Pilipino	0.00%	81.30%	0.0011	0.00%	75.90%	0.001
Other Asian	0.00%	44.10%	0.00411	0.00%	35.10%	0.001
Pacific Islander	0.00%	0.00%	0.001	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
L., C., S. Am.	70.40%	0.00%	5.30%[]	70.50%	2.10%	0.003
Caribbean	7.00%	4.30%	82.80%	6.90%	6.30%	75.00%
Black	9.60%	17.00%	73.40%	0.00%	15.30%	84.70%]]
Other African	4.70%	0.00%	87.60%]]	11.30%	0.00%	66.40411
Other Origin	95.30%	0.00%	0.00%	96.70%	3.00%	0.00%

Table 7. Ethnic Groups which gave White, Black or Asian as responses to Q.17 (Race - MCT), Canada.

!	* BTHNIC	ORIGIN (Q.15	) []	* BTHNIC II	ENTITY (Q.16	)
ETHNIC 1- GROUP 1	WHITE	ASIAN	BLACK	WHITE	ASIAN	BLACK
British Only	96.50%	0.03%	0.04 <b>%</b> ]]	95.70%	0.09%	0.00%
Prench Only	98.40%	0.00%	0.00311	92.10%	0.00%	0.00%
Canadian & British	98.00%	0.01%	0.47%]]	97.70%	0.02%	0.60%
Canadian & French	99.00%	0.00%	0.00%	99.20%	0.00%	0.00%
Canadian & Other	89.20%	2.90%	0.60%	83.70%	5.80%	1.70%
British & Prench	96.40%	0.00%	0.01%	95.20%	0.00%	0.02%
Canadian, Br & Fr	98.20%	0.00%	0.00%	95.00%	0.00%	0.00%
British & Other	92.40%	1.30%	0.90%	82.80%	5.30%	2.00%
Prench & Other	90.60%	.0.25%	0.90%	90.50%	0.70%	1.50%
Cdn, Br & Other	94.50%	0.30%	0.10%	91.80%	1.90%	0.30%
Cdn, Pr & Other	94.90%	\$00.0	0.00%]]	84.10%	0.00%	0.00%
Cdn, Br, Fr & Other	94.80%	0.00%	0.00%]]	98.40%	0.00%	0.00%
Br, Pr & Other	94.80%	0.02%	0.10 <b>%</b>	85.70%	1.80%	0.60%
Other, Other	75.40%	11.70%	3.70%   	66.00%	16.60%	8.20%
Non-response	39.60%	2.90%	2.20%	31.10%	3.20%	1.90%
Invalid J	57.53%	20.90%	1.70%	54.50%	31.80%	2.30%

Table 8: Response Patterns of Various Asian Ethnic Groups, Origins of Parents and Grandparents, (0.15) by Rece (0.17-NCT)

										-			
ETHNIC					~~~~~~		RA	CE				~~~~~~	~~~~
GROUP		MHITE	ASIAN	BLACK	SOUTH RSIAN	CHINESE	INDO-			OTHER	ASIAN &	HON-	!
SOUTH ASIAN	(177,000)	1.50%	80.10%	0.202		~~~~~		, ~~~~~~~	FILIPINO	ASIAN	OTHER	RESPONSE	INVALID
I NDO-CHI NESE	(74.000)					0.002	0.00%	800.0	0.002	1.80%	0.80%	3.20%	0.402
CHINESE				0.00%	0.002	0.002	1.20%	0.002	0.00%	0.002	0.002	0.000	1
	(374,000)	1.30%	92.40%	0.002	0.00%	0.80%	0.00%	0.00%	0.002	1.20%			1
JAPANESE	(36,000)	3.90%	85.80%	0.002	0.00%	0.002	0.002	1.602		;		11000	
FILIPINO	(120,000);	0.002	81.302	0.002	0.002	0.002				7.60%;	0.002	0.000	0.902
OTHER ASIAN	(6.000)	0.002	44.102				0.00%	0.00%	2.00%	2.30%	0.002	0.000	14.400
~ ~~~~~				0.00x:	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0-00%	0.002	0.002	0.000	55.902
South Agien - 2				~~~~~~~	~~~~~~~					:		:	

South Asian - X C.V. = 15.8; at 95% = +/- 60,000 Indo-Chinese - Z C.V. = 24; at 95% = +/- 36,000 Japanese - Z C.V. = 24.4; at 95% = +/- 18,000 Filipino - Z C.V. = 26; at 95% = +/-62,000 Other Asian - Z C.V. = 65.24; at 95% = +/- 6,000

All data rounded to nearest thousand.

Response Patterns of Various Asian Ethnic Groups, Ethnic Identity of Self. (Q.16) by Race (Q.17-MCT)

ETHNIC GROUP						,	RA	CE	~~~~~~	~~~~~~			~~~
		MHITE	ASIAN	BLACK	SOUTH ASIAN	CHINESE	INDO- CHINESE	JAPANESE	FILIPINO	OTHER RSIAN	ASIAN &	NON-	
OUTH ASIAN	(162,000)	0.60%	82.90%	0.20%	11.40%	0.002					~~~~~~	RESPONSE	INVALI
NDO-CHINESE	(00,000)		96.50%	0.002	0.00%	0.002	1.202	0.002					
I NESE	(309,000)	0.90%	97.20%	0.00%	0.002	0.12%	0.002	0.00%			0.002		
PANESE	(29,000)	2.80%	66.60X	0.000	0.002	0.00%	0.002	0.902	0.00%	9.60%	0.000	0.002	0.1
LIPINO	(135,000)		75.90X	0.00%	0.00%	0.002	0.002	0.002	1.60%	9.20%	0.00	0.002	13.3
HER ASIAN	<5,000> ;	0.000:	35.102	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.002	0.00%	0.000:	0.0021	0.002	0.002	64.9

South Reism - X C.V. = 15.76; at 95% = 51,000 Indo-Chinese - X C.V. = 241 at 95% = \*/- 46,000 Leparese - X C.V. = 2.01; at 95% = \*/- 17,000 pipine - X C.V. = 27.1; at 95% = \*/- 73,000 Other Raism - X C.V. = 78.9; at 95% = \*/- 79,000

All data rounded to nearest thousand.

Pa TONS

6,1

STATISTICS CANADA LIBRARY
IBLIOTHEQUE STATISTIQUE CANADA

1010343853